REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 have been amended. New claims 44-53 have been added[1]. Claims 1-53 are now pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Palmer in view of Laverty et al.

Claims 1-28, 30, 32, 34 and 36-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Palmer (U.S. Patent Number 6,078,403) in view of Laverty et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,429,947; hereinafter "Laverty"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants' claimed invention relates to a method of creating data for printing through page editing operation. A determination is made as to whether there is any part of a page that has not been received at the time of page editing, and if so, dummy parts data is automatically created for the unreceived parts. The dummy parts data is inserted in the place of unreceived parts in the page position allocated for the unreceived parts, creating dummy page data. The dummy parts data is replaced by received parts data when the unreceived parts data is received, thus creating page data for printing. Furthermore, the dummy parts comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding unreceived part.

[1] Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification on at least page 17, lines 12-20 and page 18, line 22 to page 19, line 4.

Turning to the cited art, Palmer discloses presentation and processing of a document having a variable data area. Portions of a base document are identified as *variable data areas*, where a page description language comment statement associated with each variable data area is inserted within stored data.

However, Palmer does not teach or suggest that "the dummy parts data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding unreceived part," as recited by claim 1.

Palmer teaches solely the presentation of variable data within a variable data area of a base document. As shown in Palmer's Figure 3, the user enters dummy data for a variable data area, wherein the dummy data includes size and formatting information (64) for the variable data area. The user entered dummy data identifies the variable data that the user desires to insert into each respective dummy data region (column 5, lines 12-17). The user selects a dummy data region within the base document (44) that the user desires to define as a variable data area (column 5, lines 21-24). Then, in Palmer's Figure 4, dummy variable data within a dummy data region is replaced, by the formatting extension (42), with page description language prolog (88), which are format parameters (column 6, lines 9-12). Additionally, the field identification extension (43) prompts the user to input the filename of a variable data file (48) that contains the variable data object to be presented within the selected variable data area of base document (44) (column 6, lines 32-37). "In response to the user specifying the filename of variable data file 48, the process proceeds to block 194, which depicts field identification extension 43 prompting the user to select a record within variable data file 48" (column 6, lines 40-44). The field

identification extension (43) then prompts the user to identify a field that contains the variable data object to be presented within the selected variable data area (column 6, lines 49-53).

Thus, there lacks any teaching or suggestion in Palmer that "the dummy parts data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding unreceived part," as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added). Further, the Examiner admits on page 3 of the Office Action that Palmer also does not expressly teach the automatic creation of dummy parts data for the unreceived parts.

Laverty does not remedy the deficiencies of Palmer. Although Laverty discloses an automated prepress application in which an operator saves particular settings for a job to be run under a certain prepress application, and which a low resolution graphical object is embedded directly into a Print Ready File for preview operation, there is also no teaching or suggestion in Laverty that "the dummy parts data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding unreceived part," as recited by claim 1.

Laverty's embedded low resolution graphical object is only used for *preview* (not page editing) operations such that the low resolution graphic is embedded in the file to keep the size of the file down to a minimum, while providing a link to a high resolution graphic. Laverty's high resolution graphic can not be interpreted as an unreceived part, nor does Laverty teach or suggest that the low resolution graphic is of a same image size as that of a corresponding unreceived part.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, the invention defined by Applicants' claim 1 is allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty. Claims 2-10, 28, 29, 36 and 40 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 1, which as established

above, distinguishes over Palmer in view of Laverty. Thus, claims 2-10, 28, 29, 36 and 40 are allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Regarding amended claim 11, claim 11 is a corresponding apparatus of method claim 1, and is allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for reasons similar to those as discussed above. In particular, Palmer in view of Laverty fails to teach or suggest that "the dummy parts data comprises an embedded image for editing *which is of a same image size* as a corresponding unreceived part," as recited in claim 11. Claims 12-20, 30, 37 and 41 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 11, which as established above, distinguishes over Palmer in view of Laverty. Thus, claims 12-20, 30, 37 and 41 are allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 21, the claimed invention relates to a system for creating printing data during page editing and layout. The claimed system comprises a data processing arrangement including a logic portion and another logic portion. The logic portion creates dummy parts data having link information for unreceived parts data, with the link information linking the dummy parts data with a storage location in a data processing arrangement. Dummy parts data is inserted in a position on the page allocated for the unreceived parts data. The another logic portion operates in background monitoring the storage location in the data processing

arrangement, and replaces the dummy parts data with the parts data in accordance with the link information, when parts data is stored at the storage location. The dummy parts data is automatically created by the logic portion when the parts data is determined not to be stored at the storage location, and the dummy parts data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding unreceived part.

The claimed invention is allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for reasons similar to those as discussed above. In particular, Palmer in view of Laverty fails to disclose that "the dummy parts data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding unreceived part" as recited in claim 21.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, the invention defined by Applicants' claim 21 is patentable over Palmer in view of Laverty. Claims 32, 38 and 42 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 21, which as established above, distinguishes over Palmer in view of Laverty. Thus, claims 32, 38 and 42 are allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for the aforementioned reasons as well as for its additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Regarding amended claim 22, the claimed invention relates to a method of editing data. Applicants' method comprises creating application data with defined page layout and file link information, storing received data, creating dummy page data for data not yet received, and replacing the dummy page data with expected data, wherein dummy page data is automatically created upon a determination that data has not been received by the time application data is

created. The dummy page data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding image of the expected data.

The claimed invention is allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for reasons similar to those as discussed above. In particular, Palmer in view of Laverty fails to teach or suggest that "said dummy page data comprises an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding image of said expected data," as recited by claim 22. At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, the invention defined by Applicants' claim 22 is patentable over Palmer in view of Laverty. Claims 23-27, 34, 39 and 43 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 21, which as established above, distinguishes over Palmer in view of Laverty. Thus, claims 23-27, 34, 39 and 43 are allowable over Palmer in view of Laverty for the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Palmer in view of Laverty et al. further in view of Warmus et al.

Claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Laverty further in view of Warmus et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,332,149 B1; "Warmus"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Palmer in view of Laverty, as discussed above, fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed elements. Warmus does not remedy the deficiencies of Palmer in view of Laverty. Warmus discloses the reproduction of images on a display device using master and variable information

for creating different versions of a book. Essentially, different versions of a book may be produced from multiple templates merging data with a database of variable information. Fixed information in the template file does not change, while variable information is linked to information stored in the database. Corresponding pages would differ in terms of the variable information stored in the database, and in some cases, would differ from fixed information depending on the design of the template files.

However, Warmus also does not teach or suggest dummy data comprising an embedded image for editing which is of a same image size as a corresponding part that has not been received. Claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 22, respectively. Thus, at least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, the invention defined by Applicants' claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are patentable over Palmer in view of Laverty further in view of Warmus. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Newly Added Claims

New claims 44-53 have been added to provide more varied protection for the present invention. Claims 44-53 are allowable based on at least their dependencies, as well as for their additionally recited features.

In particular, in regards to exemplary claim 44, none of the cited references teach or suggest that, "prior to receiving the unreceived parts data, the page editing operation is performed by **using the embedded image for editing as an alternative part for the unreceived part**," as claimed (emphasis added). Furthermore, the cited references also fail to

teach or suggest that "the embedded image for editing is of a lower resolution than the corresponding unreceived part," as recited by exemplary claim 45.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lenny R. Jiang/

Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 9, 2006